



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,096	08/09/2001	Ghim-Sim Chua	50037.SUSU1	3792
27488 7590 12/27/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/927,096

**Applicant(s)**

CHUA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Anh Ly

**Art Unit**

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5 and 7-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 3, 6 and 29-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-5 and 7-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' AENDMENT and RCE filed on 10/30/2007.

#### ***Request for Continued Examination (RCE)***

2. The request filed on 10/30/2007 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/927,096 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
3. Claims 2-3, 6 and 29-36 were cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 4-5 and 7-28 are pending in this Application.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. Applicants argued that, "The Pan, Golding and Childlovskii do not teach the claims 1, 7 13 and 21 feature." (pages 9-20, in the remarks).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, PAN (USPAT: 7,058,626 B1) teaches receiving a search query from a user and the system, and sending the search query to one of the plurality of search engines and returning the search result to the user as shown in the fig. 2 and figs. 4-5; col. 8, lines 1-67, col. 9, lines 1-67, col. 11, lines 55-67 and col. 12, lines 1-67). Also, PAN teaches translate the user's search query language to another language to another specific

language before sending the translated query to the search engine (col. 9, lines 22-45).

Golding (USPAT: 6,640,218 B1) teaches receiving a search query entered by a user through web browser and the search engine receives a query from a user through the user interface. The search engine normalizes the query by placing it into a standard format that is semantically equivalent to the query. This normalization process may include removing leading, trailing, and excess white-space characters, converting upper case characters to lower case characters, and encoding certain non-alphanumeric characters to avoid incompatibility with internally used character codes. Normalization may also include such as removing certain common words from the query (see fig. 1 and fig. 2, col. 6, lines 32-67 and col. 7, lines 1-64). And Chidlovskii (USPAT: 6,327,590) teaches search query for information retrieval system and one or more search engines or meta-search engines and search post-processor, the extended system may include one or more document collections with associated user, community/group, and rating attributes, a user profiler, a community profiler and a community manager. Additionally, the extended system may include wrappers that allow the profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collections and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results (abstract and col. 1, lines 40-62 and col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-32).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (such as in claim 7, in line 8, "a search engine wrapper", in line 11, "the native format query", "the registered search engine", in line 14, "a search query, again, "a search engine manager" and in line 16, again "a standard query" .... ).

9. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 21 recite the limitations ("a search query", "a standard query", "the native format query" "the register search engine" "wherein each of the search engine wrappers are...: in lines 7, 8, 15, 17, 18 of claim 1 for example). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**10.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 7-10, 13-16, 18-20, 21- 22 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 7,058,626 B1 issued to Pan et al. (hereinafter Pan) in view of Patent No.: US 6,327,590 B1 issued to Chidlovskii et al. (hereinafter Chidlovskii) and further in view of US Patent No.: US 6640218 B1 issued to Golding et al. (hereinafter Golding).

With respect to claim 1, Pan teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components (figs. 1, 2 and 3), comprising:

a search engine manager configured to receive a search query from a client and to translate the search query to a standard query, wherein the standard query is

universally formatted for a plurality of search engines registered with the search engine manager, and to communicate the standard query from the search engine manager to each of the plurality of search engines registered with the search engine manager (fig. 4 (item 401) and fig. 2: a plurality of search engines (fig. 4, item 402); and

each of the search engines translates the standard query to a native format query of a registered search engines associated with a registered search engines, wherein each of the search engine translates the standard query into a different native format, and to communicate the native format query to the registered search engine being further configured to return results from the registered search engine to the search engine manager (every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine: fig. 4, col. 8, lines 30-67 and col. 11, lines 1-25).

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not explicitly teach search engine wrappers and search engines.

However, Chidlovskii teaches search query for information retrieval system and one or more search engines or meta-search engines and search post-processor, the extended system may include one or more document collections with associated user, community/group, and rating attributes, a user profiler, a community profiler and a community manager. Additionally, the extended system may include wrappers that

allow the profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collections and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results (abstract and col. 1, lines 40-62 and col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-32).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pan and Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40). Pan and Chidlovskii do not teach receiving user input the query and then translate user input into a language that the search engines can accept and construct query command.

However, Golding teaches receiving a search query entered by a user through web browser and the search engine receives a query from a user through the user interface. The search engine normalizes the query by placing it into a standard format that is semantically equivalent to the query. This normalization process may include removing leading, trailing, and excess white-space characters, converting upper case characters to lower case characters, and encoding certain non-alphanumeric characters



to avoid incompatibility with internally used character codes. Normalization may also include such as removing certain common words from the query (see fig. 1 and fig. 2).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, and further in view of Golding, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Golding to the system of Pan to have a search query in the format of normalized query or standard format prior to forming a meta search to a plurality of search engines in the system. The motivation being to have the search result that has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results.

With respect to claim 7, Pan teaches a computer-implemented method for communicating between a client and a plurality of search engines in a distributed processing system (figs. 1, 2 and 3), comprising the step of:

receiving a search query having a plurality of search parameters, the search query being generated by a search client (fig. 1-4 and items 401 and 402 in fig. 4);

issuing the standard query to each of the plurality of search engines (fig. 4, item 405); and

at each of the plurality of search engines, translating the standard query to a native format query for a search engine associated with the search engine, wherein the native format query is unique to the search engine (every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a

native format to communicate with the respective search engine: fig. 4, col. 8, lines 30-67 and col. 11, lines 1-25);

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach search engine wrappers and search engines.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67) and one or more search engines or meta-search engines and search post-processor, the extended system may include one or more document collections with associated user, community/group, and rating attributes, a user profiler, a community profiler and a community manager. Additionally, the extended system may include wrappers that allow the profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collections and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results (abstract and col. 1, lines 40-62 and col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-32).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pan and Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2,

lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40). Pan and Chidlovskii do not teach receiving the standard query at each of the plurality of search engines and building a standard query from the search query.

However, Golding teaches receiving a search query entered by a user through web browser and the search engine receives a query from a user through the user interface. The search engine normalizes the query by placing it into a standard format that is semantically equivalent to the query. This normalization process may include removing leading, trailing, and excess white-space characters, converting upper case characters to lower case characters, and encoding certain non-alphanumeric characters to avoid incompatibility with internally used character codes. Normalization may also include such as removing certain common words from the query (see fig. 1 and fig. 2).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, and further in view of Golding, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Golding to the system of Pan to have a search query in the format of normalized query or standard format prior to forming a meta search to a plurality of search engines in the system. The motivation being to have the search result that has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results.

With respect to claims 8-10, Pan teaches a computer-implemented method for communicating between a client and a plurality of search engines as discussed in claim 7.

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach search engine wrappers.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan with the teachings of Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40).

With respect to claim 13, Pan teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps (see figs. 1-4), comprising:

registering a search engine to provide searching capabilities (figs. 4-5; abstract and col. 7, lines 22-32);

passing the standard query from the search engine manager associated with the registered search engine (fig. 4, item 405); translating the standard query to a translated query in a native format of the registered search engine, wherein each of the translated the standard query into a different native format (abstract, fig. 4, item 403 and every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine: fig. 4, col. 8, lines 30-67 and col. 11, lines 1-25);

transmitting the translated query to the registered search engine (every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine: fig. 4, col. 8, lines 30-67 and col. 11, lines 1-25 and item 405 in fig. 4); and

receiving results of the translated query from the registered search engine (item 406 in fig. 4).

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach Pan does not clearly teach search engine wrappers and search engines.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67) and one or more search engines or meta-search engines and search post-processor, the extended system may include one or more document collections with associated user, community/group, and rating attributes, a user profiler, a community profiler and a

community manager. Additionally, the extended system may include wrappers that allow the profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collections and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results (abstract and col. 1, lines 40-62 and col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-32).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pan and Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40). Pan and Chidlovskii do not teach receiving, at a search engine manager, a client query from a client and building a standard query from the client query received from the client.

However, Golding teaches receiving a search query entered by a user through web browser and the search engine receives a query from a user through the user interface. The search engine normalizes the query by placing it into a standard format that is semantically equivalent to the query. This normalization process may include removing leading, trailing, and excess white-space characters, converting upper case

characters to lower case characters, and encoding certain non-alphanumeric characters to avoid incompatibility with internally used character codes. Normalization may also include such as removing certain common words from the query (see fig. 1 and fig. 2).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, and further in view of Golding, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Golding to the system of Pan to have a search query in the format of normalized query or standard format prior to forming a meta search to a plurality of search engines in the system. The motivation being to have the search result that has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results.

With respect to claim 14, Pan teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach an associated wrapper with a common registration service.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan with the teachings of Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving

the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40).

With respect to claims 15-16 and 20, Pan teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach a wrapper ID that uniquely identifies the associated wrapper, and storing other information, in a database associated with the common registration service; and a multiplicity of wrappers associated with other search engines to receive the standard query.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 4, lines 15-54, col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan with the teachings of Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her



search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40).

With respect to claim 18, Pan teaches wherein building the standard query further comprises combining, by a query generation module, the client query with other parameters received from the client (figs 1-5 and 8).

With respect to claim 19, Pan teaches wherein translating the standard query further comprises transforming the standard query to the native format of the search engine through the use of a translation module (every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine: fig. 4, col. 8, lines 30-67 and col. 11, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 21, Pan teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps (figs.1-5), comprising:

discovering at least one search engine registered with a search system, transmitting the standard query and to translate the standard query to a native format query associated with the at least one search engine registered with the search system, requesting a response from the at least one search engine wrapper the response including a progress update for the standard query as it is executed and the results of the standard query; and receiving the response (figs. 1-5 and 7: every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query

into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine: fig. 4, col. 8, lines 30-67 and col. 11, lines 1-25).

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach Pan does not clearly teach search engine wrappers and search engines.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67) and one or more search engines or meta-search engines and search post-processor, the extended system may include one or more document collections with associated user, community/group, and rating attributes, a user profiler, a community profiler and a community manager. Additionally, the extended system may include wrappers that allow the profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collections and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results (abstract and col. 1, lines 40-62 and col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-32). And search query for information retrieval system and a meta-searcher as a wrapper (abstract and col. 1, lines 40-62 and col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-32).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pan and Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found

it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40). Pan and Chidlovskii do not teach receiving, at a search engine manager, a client query from a client and building a standard query from the client query received from the client.

However, Golding teaches receiving a search query entered by a user through web browser and the search engine receives a query from a user through the user interface. The search engine normalizes the query by placing it into a standard format that is semantically equivalent to the query. This normalization process may include removing leading, trailing, and excess white-space characters, converting upper case characters to lower case characters, and encoding certain non-alphanumeric characters to avoid incompatibility with internally used character codes. Normalization may also include such as removing certain common words from the query (see fig. 1 and fig. 2).

Therefore, based on Pan in view of Chidlovskii, and further in view of Golding, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Golding to the system of Pan to have a search query in the format of normalized query or standard format prior to forming a meta search to a plurality of search engines in the system. The motivation being to have the

search result that has been properly narrowed significant problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results.

With respect to claim 22, Pan teaches wherein discovering at least one search engine registered with the search system further comprises accessing a search engine store to retrieve identification information for the at least one search engine registered with the search system (abstract, col. 4, lines 18-67).

With respect to claims 24-25, and 28, Pan teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 21.

Pan teaches receiving an original query request from a user and then translates this query into a standard query to associate with a dedicated language going with each of search engines in the system. Pan does not clearly teach search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 4, lines 15-54, col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan with the teachings of Chidlovskii. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of search query and meta-searcher wrapper for performing a search/retrieving the results as disclosed (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30), into the system of Pan for the purpose of assisting the user in refining or narrowing his/her search query, therefore, the search result has been properly narrowed significant

problem in information retrieval is how to rank the results (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 30-40).

With respect to claim 26, Pan teaches wherein the response received indicates that the standard query is complete (abstract, and figs. 4-5).

With respect to claim 27, Pan teaches wherein the response received indicates that the standard query failed because a time limit for receiving a response is exceeded (fig. 4-5 and 7).

11. Claims 4-5, 11-12, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,058,626 B1 issued to Pan et al. (hereinafter Pan) in view of Patent No.: US 6,327,590 B1 issued to Chidlovskii et al. (hereinafter Chidlovskii), and further in view of US Patent No.: US 6640218 B1 issued to Golding et al. (hereinafter Golding) and Patent No.: US 6,430,552 B1 issued to Corston-Oliver (hereinafter Corston-Oliver).

With respect to claims 4-5, Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches Component Object Model (COM) interface for search engine (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface for enabling users to search and filter on certain criteria. The motivation being to retrieve data that users either search through an index data to locate the data they desire (Corston-Oliver's col. 1, lines 10-20).

With respect to claim 11, Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 7.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches Component Object Model (COM) interface for search engine (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface for enabling users to search and filter on certain criteria. The motivation being to retrieve data that users either search through an index data to locate the data they desire (Corston-Oliver's col. 1, lines 10-20).

With respect to claim 12, Pan teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 7.

Pan teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Pan does not clearly teach search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Pan's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 17, Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches Component Object Model (COM) interface for search engine (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan in view of Chidlovskii and with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface for enabling users to search and filter on certain criteria. The motivation being to retrieve data that users either search through an index data to locate the data they desire (Corston-Oliver's col. 1, lines 10-20).

With respect to claim 23, Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 21.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Pan, Chidlovskii and Golding do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches Component Object Model (COM) interface for search engine (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pan in view of Chidlovskii and Golding with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface for enabling users to search and filter on certain criteria. The motivation being



Application/Control Number:  
09/927,096  
Art Unit: 2162


Page 24


to retrieve data that users either search through an index data to locate the data they desire (Corston-Oliver's col. 1, lines 10-20).

**Contact Information**

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (Written Authorization being given by Applicant (MPEP 502.03 [R-2])) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (Unofficial fax number directly to examiner). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reached on (571) 272-4107.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**

ANH LY   
DEC 16<sup>th</sup>, 2007

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100